Vol. XI, No. 11 HUMAN EVENTS March 17, 1954

RIGHT WING PAPERS NEED RIGHT WING WRITERS

By HANDICAPPER

A FEW WEEKS AGO Drew Pearson, in a confidential aside to his public, mentioned a conversation with President Eisenhower at the Paris GHQ of NATO in 1952. "I had the temerity to point out," wrote Pearson, "that his chief problem as President would be with the isolationist wing of the Republican Party, the China Lobby and one of its chief spokesmen, Sen. McCarthy."

A politician wiser to the tricks of the trade than Mr. Eisenhower was at that time might have suspected what Pearson was trying to convey; namely, that unless Eisenhower and his Administration played second fiddle to the Fair Deal Democrats, Eisenhower could expect a steady drumfire from "liberal" columnists, pink Washington correspondents and egg-headed commentators. Pearson reported that the Ike of 1952 "listened carefully, but it was obvious from the questions he asked that he did not understand that phase of the problem ahead of him. Today, of course, he certainly should understand it."

Indeed he should. Ever since Eisenhower was sworn into office — rather, ever since his nomination — the General has been relentlessly pursued by a group of Fair Deal reporters and commentators whose objective is to sucker the President into statements and acts which will divide the Republican Party and thereby make straight the way for Adlai Stevenson, or some other crypto-liberal Messiah, to march into the White House. Those who read the efforts of Pearson, *les freres* Alsop, Tom Stokes, Marquis Childs or Roscoe Drummond, not to mention the works of several White House reporters, realize that the campaign is on.

But the astounding aspect of this well-oiled anti-G.O.P. and anti-Eisenhower propaganda drive is that it is made possible by conservative and Republican newspaper publishers and sponsors of radio and television broadcasts, who worked like crazy to get Truman out of the White House and Eisenhower in. Millions of readers and listeners throughout the United States are assailed daily by skillful if often pompous Fair Deal propaganda paid for by rich and presumably anti-Fair Deal sponsors.

THIS BATTLE GOES back to the 1952 Eisenhower campaign, when, on the basis of some irresponsible statements about Dick Nixon's private finances, the Fair Deal commentators attempted to blow the G.O.P. campaign out of the water before it had more than cleared the breakwater. It has persisted with endless variations through the President's press conferences and up and down the congressional committee hearing rooms, from one

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dubious "crisis" to the next, until it would seem that the "education" of Dwight Eisenhower ought to be complete.

Invariably, or almost invariably, the boys palm off their propaganda as if their purpose was to save Eisenhower from bad advice by "isolationists" and other wicked gold brick salesmen. Attorney General Brownell's revelations of Harry Dexter White's real identity was described by Marquis Childs as "a two-edged sword." He feared that "many who were behind Mr. Eisenhower in the campaign last year believed he would end the divisiveness and distrust." It seems the exposure of a Red spy in the Truman fold was a form of — you guessed it — "McCarthyism." Tom Stokes allowed how the White affair indicated that the G.O.P.'s "dirty political slip" was showing.

To Roscoe Drummond, the squabble between Secretary of the Army Stevens and Joe McCarthy represents the "peak of irresponsibility," although he doesn't say just how. Even a Fair Dealer can hardly have forgotten the Pearl Harbor investigations, the hearings to probe the firing of MacArthur, or even the Truman Committee to ride herd on the armed services during World War II. The "irresponsibility" therefore, would appear to consist in Joe McCarthy's rhetoric, and not in the right of Congress to ask questions of brigadier generals. The "irresponsibility" of the gentlemen of the press who represented the Army as "surrendering to McCarthy" is something which has to be left to the consciences of our gullible "press lords." They bought it.

It was largely in Republican, or crypto-Republican, newspapers, that the Alsop brothers launched their time-bomb against Dr. Clarence Manion of Notre Dame, who had agreed to serve as Chairman of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. Dr. Manion's views are mainly those of Eisenhower's 1952 campaign contributors, not to mention the speech-makers and the Republican Platform. To the Alsops, Dr. Manion was a "professional orator before extreme Right Wing Republican audiences." For "extreme Right Wing" read "anti-Fair Deal." Nevertheless, out went Dr. Manion, apparently for sponsoring the sorely needed Bricker Amendment. For once the Column Cabal appeared to have allies inside the stockade.

Also, according to Pearson, it is necessary to save the President from the "China Lobby" — meaning those who stand behind our firm ally Chiang Kai-shek, as opposed to the diplomats who still plot an Asiatic Munich. In plugging the familiar anti-Chiang line, Pearson managed to touch up at least four senators and to accuse Mr. Eisenhower of "repudiating his Secretary of State" in behalf of the "China Lobby." The President's adherence to the firm American policy toward China seemed disappointing to Pearson. He reported (April 25, 1953) that he had earlier tipped off the President to the iniquities of the "China Lobby's" pet Senators, but the President, "then new in politics, expressed incredulity that U.S. Senators would accept campaign expenses from the China Lobby." It could be, of course, that Mr. Eisenhower was not so "new in politics" as to regard Pearson as the best available tutor in the art.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course "McCarthyism" is the catalytic agent by means of which the Fair Deal press crowd hopes to encompass the fall of Eisenhower and the defeat of the Republican Administration. Every presidential press conference must postpone important news while the little group of Fair Deal troublemakers goes through the routine of leading the President into trouble. Up to now he has managed to cake-walk over the mined field with considerable skill.

But if he expresses the view that Congressional committees should not use rough language to Army officers, or that it would be unfair to say that *all* Democrats are traitors, the newspapers (including "right-wing" newspapers) can be relied on to report next day that Eisenhower has rebuked McCarthy, or "showed his displeasure" with McCarthy, or indicated that next week he will give McCarthy the business. It seems that (Stewart Alsop) "McCarthyism and its twin, McLeodism, are reducing all but the bravest American foreign representatives to timid automatons".

Therefore it is the duty of the Fair Deal propagandists to push McCarthy down the President's throat until he decides to be "master of his own house" — meaning an instrument of the Fair Dealers in their campaign to smash the G.O.P. "Disinterested journalists" in Washington even go so far as to make the daily McCarthy story out of whole cloth. Thus somebody mouse-trapped McCarthy into snapping at Secretary of Defense Wilson by misrepresenting what Wilson had said about Communists in the Army. Actually what Wilson said was largely an endorsement of McCarthy's efforts.

In the same package with the fiction that, on account of "McCarthyism", American writers live in such fear and trepidation that they never know whether the Book of the Month Club is going to take their next book, the left-of-center columnists include this one: that Congressional investigations are ruining our reputation abroad. "The effects of McCarthyism in spreading doubt and distrust of America in Europe cannot be disputed" (Marquis Childs).

Mr. Brownell's re-exposure of the late Harry Dexter White, also according to Mr. Childs, was calculated to cause Europeans to feel that we lacked "political maturity and sobriety". Walter Lippmann and Mrs. Roosevelt have beaten their breasts mournfully over the destruction of American prestige by McCarthy and his ilk. Lippmann hysterically urged the President to go out and challenge McCarthy on the ground that otherwise McCarthy will "go on until he is master of the party". In other words, "Let's you and him fight!"

On this matter of who is responsible for the alleged loss of America's good name abroad and the terror that walketh at noonday in Grub Street, we have some interesting recent testimony. After one of the Senator's hearings, a former Communist, Peter A. Gragis, who had been employed in the plant of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratory at Nutley, New Jersey, said, according to the *New York Times* (March 11), that "he was certain that other former Communists would also come forward to tell their stories if they were not deterred by stories that Senator McCarthy would 'abuse and crucify' them. Mr. Gragis said a false picture had been painted by 'left-wing and Communist newspapers'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and even by 'respectable newspapers'. In the latter group he named the New York *Herald-Tribune, Newsday* (Long Island) and the *Washington Post.*"

IF RESPECTABILITY CONSISTS in printing distorted accounts of Congressional investigations, thereby deterring reformed Communists from coming forward to aid in thwarting the Red conspiracy in our midst, then lead us to the Penny Dreadfuls! Senator McCarthy's manners in public may not be as suave as those of some of his hoity-toity critics, but, like the Geese of the Capitoline, he is doing his best to warn the Republic of its danger. Somehow or other the pained embarrassment of our columnar friends in the face of the supposed disapproval of refined and "neutralist" Europe will have to be endured. So will the stunned dread of intellectuals who would rather leave a Communist cell in the Army undisturbed than hear sharp words addressed to a General — unless, of course, the General happened to be Douglas MacArthur.

The left-wing purpose in inflating "McCarthyism" beyond any semblance of reality is to discredit and eventually destroy the investigatory powers of Congress. If McCarthy should go under, the boys would promptly set up Jenner in the next alley, and so on down the line until the last man with the guts to challenge the NKVD operatives in our midst had been disposed of. Just how this transparent Kremlin objective is transferred to the intellectuals and egg-headed columnists who are not Communists — and to the rich publishers, also not Communists, who pay the Fair Deal columnists — is the mystery of the present time.

If the conservative, "extreme right-wing" Tories who own most of the newspapers or advertise their wares on the radio want to "give both sides" by sponsoring Fair Deal columnists, well and good. These journalists are capable and persuasive men who have some popular following. Nobody wants to see them begging for bread.

But is it unreasonable to expect the newspapers actually to give both sides? They might expose their customers also to the enlightening influence of David Lawrence, Raymond Moley, George Sokolsky, Frank R. Kent and a few others who can still write the news without first asking themselves, "Would F.D.R. like it?" Many newspapers publish these conservative commentators, but I have an idea that statistics will prove that even Mrs. Roosevelt has more "outlets", and in conservative newspapers, too, than any of the "extreme rightists" just mentioned!

Really, the moderate conservative American press needs to get on to itself. "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed", except on loaded alfalfa. Something needs to be done to persuade conservatives that it isn't smart to spend twenty years trying to get a Republican Administration and then pay New Deal columnists to get the Democrats and left-wingers back in again.

We offered HUMAN EVENTS as a safety valve to a long-suffering sub-editor of a large "right-wing" publication. Hence, he prefers to be known as "Handicapper."

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume XI, No. 11 Wednesday, March 17, 1954 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY RECORDS

In the Wings of the McCarthy Drama: The new turn in L'Affaire McCarthy has resulted in much finger-crossing among observers in the Capital. McCarthy withdraws temporarily from the probe of the Army and Sen. Mundt assumes temporary chairmanship of the investigation into the facts of the cross-charges between Stevens and Adams on the one hand, and McCarthy, Cohn and Carr on the other. This represents a victory for the Pentagon boys, for the Wisconsin Senator seemed to be getting pretty close to really embarrassing revelations about Stevens' department. On the other hand, a pause should enable McCarthy to catch his breath, for he had been badly cornered by enfilading fire from pro-Communist forces. No one here wants to hazard a guess today as to the outcome.

Meanwhile, it is possible to re-assess some of the more heated features of last week's conflict and to answer some burning questions.

(1) Why did McCarthy hire the currently controversial Cohn? First and foremost, because of his brilliant record as an anti-Communist lawyer. He had shown a thorough knowledge of theoretical Communism, intimacy with the Communistic technique, and thorough command of the court methods necessary for meeting these skilled conspirators. The fact that he is of the Jewish faith also had some influence, for the left-wingers had been trying to pin the anti-semitic label on McCarthy. Schine came along with Cohn because he also was dedicated to the cause of anti-Communism and was anxious to "do something". It is interesting to note that the left-wingers were not deterred from using the appeal to bigotry even with these two Jewish boys. As one of the Fifth-Amendment witnesses said, of Cohn, "He is a disgrace to his people".

(2) How did the left-wingers smear Cohn and Schine? The old stunt — worked many times in the press — of attacking anyone from Congress who ventured to examine critically the left-wing's monopoly in our foreign service operations was staged over the perfectly proper visit of these two McCarthy investigators to Europe last year. An American newspaperman in Germany is beholden to the American authorities there not only for news, but even for the lease on his apartment. Hence, when American authorities (now headed by Conant!) feed out news to the journalists, they put it — they had better put it — on the wires. The result was the international smear of Cohn and Schine.

Radio Commentator Fulton Lewis' explanation of this phenomenon on his broadcast on March 15 was dead right. We ourselves witnessed a similar "hex" put on a visiting group of American senators in Madrid in 1949. We were on the spot at the time on holiday and witnessed the whole shocking attack directed at the senators from the Madrid Embassy.

(3) Why do not other senators and congressmen help McCarthy? Jealousy — pure jealousy. It is often remarked about the Senate: "There are 96 kings, each jealous of his own position." This phenomenon is by no means unusual, although a constituent would have to see it to believe it. It happened in the case of Taft who received little forthright open support from colleagues usually classified as Taft men. Taft was hated and envied by many of the right-wing G.O.P. senators. He had greater ability and intellectual stature. Today, they hate McCarthy because he — not they — gets the headlines.

This is not so of Jenner and a handful of others. Jenner quietly works in McCarthy's behalf. Thus, he, as Chairman, put McCarthy on his powerful Senate Rules Committee last fall. Since that body

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passes on requests for funds from the various chairmen of committees and subcommittees (they are numerous) few of these gentlemen wished to block McCarthy's own request for a big appropriation. Hence the 85 to 1 vote for the money to keep Joe's committee going.

(4) Who is McCarthy shooting at, in this affray? The target is the Department of the Army, not Stevens, who is just another gullible business man caught in the meshes of bureaucracy. McCarthy wants to expose the person or persons in the Army who have obviously been protecting such creatures as the "Fifth Amendment" Major Peress. As George Sokolsky remarked in his broadcast of March 14th, the Wisconsin Senator touched a very "sensitive nerve", when he went after this quarry. That's always so when an investigation gets close to the "higher-ups".

In conclusion, observers here believe that what the public wants, and is entitled to receive, is not so much clarification of the hulabaloo over Cohn and Schine but the answer to the paramount question: who in the Government has been protecting and covering up for Communists and other security risks in the Army? That is the issue.

New States: In the past twenty-four hours, criticism of the bill to make states of Hawaii and Alaska has mounted. Members of Congress see in it a sign of the further decline of the American Republic. The question of what is best, not for Hawaii and Alaska, but for the present union of 48 states has been forgotten.

Take the case of Hawaii. The white population of Hawaii in 1949 was 139,398; in 1950 it was 102,998; and in 1951 it dwindled drastically to 45,794 (about 9.74% of the total population) a substantial part of which are Federal government employees. Hawaii has a total population of about 470,000 persons, the Japanese numbering 184,732, or 39.5%. Thus over ninety percent of the Hawaiian population is foreign, or near foreign in birth. These peoples have nothing in common with the basic European stocks which founded America and which today constitute an overwhelming percentage of its people. One would think that we had enough unassimilated legal immigrants — to say nothing of an estimated three to five million unassimilated illegal immigrants who are here without our permission, to whom the Constitution and the American way of life are still mysteries without adding a state to the Union dominated by Asiatics. If Hawaii is admitted to statehood the outlook is for one white senator, one Japanese senator and one native Hawaiian or half-breed Portuguese representative.

But there are two other important factors to be considered. First — the population of Hawaii cannot possibly support itself from the island's resources. The economy of Hawaii is largely dependent on U.S. government spending there. Some $4 millions are turned loose each week by the Federal government for civilian and military personnel. If, in the future, because of technical advances in the art of war, U.S. defense is based primarily on the continental U.S.A. — and military spending is curtailed in Hawaii — it could become, as a state, a complete burden on the nation's taxpayers.

(2) Those advocating Hawaiian statehood make much of its being necessary for U.S. defense. If that is so, why did we let the Philippines go? They were also a defense, perhaps a better one. But if Hawaii is necessary for our defense, won't it be a better defense as a territory than as a state?

Hawaii is in fact ridden with Communism. It is the place where Harry Bridges' Communist-dominated unions have tied up the whole territory with strikes. Those trying to get statehood for Hawaii soft-pedal the menace of Communism there. But Congressman Wint Smith (R., Kan.) says that the menace is not to be discounted. With statehood the Communists could exercise a considerable and dangerous measure of control over Hawaii by electing a Governor and legislature obedient to their objectives. As a territory the Federal government can exercise a much firmer controlling hand on the islands so that they will effectively guard our West Coast.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressman Smith crisply says: "To go halfway across the Pacific Ocean to give statehood to an Asiatic people, different in every way from our own, is to violate every tradition of our people built up since this nation started."

Not Merely Gossip: Washington political observers get reports from New Jersey suggesting that Republicans may defeat themselves in at least one crucial congressional election next fall. That is the 6th Congressional District, where a heated Republican primary has just started. A Taft Republican, Walter Margetts, Jr., of Passaic, is opposed by former Congressman Clifford Case of Rahway, who is notoriously "me-too" and is the idol of the CIO. If Case wins, it is feared that many of the Margetts followers will "sit on their hands" next November, thereby ensuring victory for the Democrat.

● That "victory over the Communists" at Caracas claimed by Secretary of State Dulles is viewed with some dubiety here. *Vision,* fortnightly on Latin American affairs (231 E. 51 St., New York, N. Y.), runs a final cable from Caracas saying: "Glamor boy of conference is Guatemalan Toriello who is being dined wined danced by all Latin American delegations stop he represents anti yankee feeling which very manifest although not outspoken stop almost everybody very pessimistic practical results conference."

● The first casualty reported as a result of the failure to pass either the Bricker or George Amendments seem to be Senator Homer Ferguson of Michigan. Ferguson voted "against", when George's measure, a substitute for the Bricker Amendment, came up for decision. Resentment is widespread in Michigan, we hear, particularly in the western part of the state. It is the opinion of observers that in next fall's election a sufficient number of conservative Republicans would abstain from voting for Ferguson thus causing his defeat in the final election. However that may be, it is known that a movement is under way to run Representative Paul Shafer, from a western district of Michigan, as an opponent to Ferguson in the GOP primary. Shafer has strong support, not only in the west but in other parts of Michigan. Meanwhile, a reconsideration of the Amendment vote hangs in abeyance in the Senate. The Shafer boom would probably collapse if Ferguson changed his stand.

Democratic Plight: Democrats are worried privately about their own unity which is one reason they raise such a furor over "McCarthyism" in the GOP. They are worried about '56, because they have no looming Fuehrer of the status of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Adlai is just a "little joker" to many down South, and a "sissy" to the boys in the club-houses up North. F.D.R. Jr. is of uncertain timber, partly because his brother James has given the name of Roosevelt some bad odor among the "church-going folks".

There is, however, one Democratic personage whose rapid political growth and popularity should make him a strong contender for the nomination. That is Governor Frank J. Lausche of Ohio. He is what the rank and file in the cities want and not a few in the county seats too. He is warm and attractive. He's the best vote-getter the Democrats have ever had in Ohio. He would not come out against Taft the last time Taft ran and supposedly voted for that Republican. He would appeal to many wobbly GOP voters who liked Taft and don't like the way the Ike Administration is going. He's not on friendly terms with the labor bosses, and hence the rank-and-file labor union members think of him as a protector against those tycoons. The Jim Farleys of the Democratic Party favor him and entertain visions of Lausche sweeping the North in 1956. But even the Farleys recognize one fatal defect.

An irresistible popular demand for him might well rise in the North. But he is a problem for the politicos, since they know he wouldn't get far in states below the Mason and Dixon line. Why? Because Lausche is a Roman Catholic, and the politicos have bitter memories of what happened to Al Smith, their candidate, in 1928. And therefore — while shouting that the GOP is split — they mournfully contemplate the big split in their own party.

Human Rights Commission: This Commission (an arm of the UN) is preparing to submit a Covenant on Human Rights in the form of a treaty to be ratified by UN member nations. Our American Bar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Association has already denounced earlier drafts as embodying a blue print for world socialism. The latest draft being concocted by the Commission is apparently equally committed to promoting world socialism. After a week's debate on whether the draft should include an article recognizing the right to own private property, the Commission by a vote of 12-2 voted to adjourn. The Commission has thus postponed indefinitely consideration of the inclusion of such a vital article. Nothing could be plainer than that Communists and socialists are in complete control of the UN Commission on Human Rights and that their intellectual handiwork should be promptly pigeon-holed by our Senate if the UN submits it for ratification.

The Squeeze: A couple of quarterly statements — one from the Dow Chemical Company, the other from the International Harvester Company — throw an interesting light on the economic scene. In both instances, the companies report that while their sales in 1953 showed an increase over those of 1952, their earnings (before taxes) were less. This experience — of earning less despite an increase of volume — is repeated in a comparison between the 1952 and 1951 figures. If this is a trend — that the more business you do the less you have left — then it follows that management will soon lose its enthusiasm for expansion. It is not good for the country when the attitude of industry changes from "let's go" to "what's the use".

When profits do not rise with sales, management will look for "leaks" — for costs that can be eliminated without affecting production or sales. But, the biggest cost of production is wages, and since management has little or no control over this item, the best it can do is to peck away at the minor cost-areas in which it can make decisions, office wages, advertising, printing bills, etc. Efficient management is always looking for "leaks", and it is to be assumed that nothing has been overlooked in an effort to better the dwindling sales-profits ratio.

Well, then, can the prices be increased so as to make productive effort worth while? It can be taken for granted that in fixing its prices any efficient company will charge "as much as the traffic will bear". But, this figure is determined by competition, not management. To raise prices over the market simply means that the company will lose its trade. Loss of some trade might not be a bad thing, seeing that profits do not rise with sales; but, if it continues, the company might find itself out of business. Competition is keener now than it has been since before the Korean War.

So, industry is in a vise. The lower arm is a rigid wage scale, the upper a price level that is being pushed down by competition. Profits are squeezed out of sales. So long as there are any profits left capital will continue to hope, and will try to maneuver for more. But, when there are no more profits at all, when to stay in business one must pay for the privilege, what will happen? And when that happens, will the country, the people, be in better shape? If industry quits, what happens to wages?

Another Trap for American Dollars: Latest form of international bribery to recruit American support for more foreign spending is the "essay contest". The Pakistan Embassy has sponsored an essay contest to improve relations and understanding between U.S. and Pakistan. Naturally, to have a chance to win, our school children who compete must say nice things about Pakistan and be unusually careful not to see any seamy side. The winner was a Texas high school senior — and his Congressman put his winning essay into the Congressional Record — calling it an excellent essay on Pakistan. The prize — a 30-day all-expense-paid trip to Pakistan. How much longer will the American public tolerate the propagandization of school children through such contests?

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED